What Brazil Said at Punta del Este, P. 3

How Our New Anti-Castro "Incompatibility" Doctrine Clashes With Our Obligations in the UN, Page 2

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. X, NO. 7 FEBRUARY 19, 1962 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

The Mythology of the Anti-Missile Missile

The anti-missile missile, which has become the excuse for resumption of nuclear testing, may usefully be examined from the standpoint of mythology, as a relic of belief in the supernatural. The anti-missile missile is only the latest of those ultimate weapons on which our hopes have rested for a military miracle, in this case for something like the invisible and impenetrable cloak which enables the hero in the fairy tale to emerge victoriously unscathed from amid enemy swords and lances. This belief in an ultimate magical weapon, like other superstitions, survives all demonstration to the contrary. We had the atom bomb years before the Russians and they had both the H-bomb and the ICBM before we did, but none of these earlier ultimate weapons enabled one side to force the surrender of the other. To the delusions of the irresistible offensive is now added the delusion of the insuperable defense. We think of the anti-missile missile in terms of Buck Rogers. We see the tense comic strip panel in which our side (or theirs) says, "Their (or our) missiles are landing but our (or their) missiles have been halted in mid-flight by some mysterious new anti-missile device. There is nothing left to do but phone Khrushchev (or Kennedy) to surrender. Capitalism (or communism) has conquered the world."

Our Modern Witch Doctors

This delusion reflects a faith in science which has nothing to do with a faith in the methods of experiment and reason. It is a faith in the magical potency of science, and thus little different from any primitive tribesman's belief in his witch doctor. We believe our wonder workers, if only given ample funds, will come up with some new weapon that will once and for all smash our enemies. From a sober military point of view, this faith in any one weapon is ludicrous. As Gen. Bradley said in that speech at St. Alban's here in Washington Nov. 5, 1957, which was so hastily buried by our opinion makers, "Missiles will bring anti-missiles, and anti-missiles will bring anti-anti-missiles. But inevitably this whole electronic house of cards will reach a point where it can be constructed no higher." The hope of an anti-missile rests on the fact that the ballistic missile follows a fixed trajectory. The hope of an anti-anti-missile rests on the possibility of changing that trajectory in mid-flight. The hope of both rests on the experience that for any weapon of war there is always a counter weapon to be found, and so on ad infinitum, that is, if the human race lasts.

All this is worth a closer explanation because the business of arranging a meeting in mid-air between a missile and an anti-missile is more complex even than arranging a meeting of minds between the White House and the Kremlin. This is how you start to construct an anti-missile. You know the missile follows a fixed curve. Therefore once it rises far enough above the radar horizon to enable you to map the beginning of the curve, you can determine the rest of the curve. The problem is to build an electronic device capable of computing this in the few minutes available, and automatically aiming your anti-missile to some intermediate point on that curve where it can hit the oncoming enemy missile before it reaches your territory. It is, as has been said crudely, like hitting a bullet with a bullet. This problem is hard enough. The real problem of the anti-missile however is much harder. It is the problem of designing an electronic network of anti-missile batteries which can cope not with one missile but with a flood of missiles accompanied by several times as many decoys, distinguishing the real from the false, and determining in split seconds which of your anti-missiles is going to be aimed at which missile.

Nobody knows whether this belongs in the realm of electronics or in Grimm's Fairy Tales as revised by General Dynamics. Dr. Hans Bethe, in that speech at Cornell on January 5 which set the arms race crowd gunning for him, said he did not think "any really effective" anti-missile was possible. "It is not very difficult," he said, "to design a defensive missile

(Continued on Page Four)

Sliding Into War and Censorship

"Mr. Harriman said there is no PRESENT [emphasis added] policy to use American combat troops, but some American personnel are operating air and other transportation for South Vietnam."

—Washington Star, *Feb. 13: Senate Foreign Relations hearing on nomination of W. Averell Harriman to be Ass't Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs.*

"U.S. Marine officers who have just completed a reconnaissance of mountain trails against A POSSIBLE FUTURE COMMITMENT OF MARINE COMBAT TROOPS [emphasis added] against the Communists, inspected the traps. Their findings will be applied in jungle warfare exercises on the northern tip of Okinawa."

—*"Vietnam Hunters Harass U.S. Aides, Aboriginal Katu Tribesmen Set Poisoned Traps," Homer Bigart in the* New York Times *Feb. 12 from Vietnam.*

Q. Mr. President, there seems to be some doubt . . . as to the right of the American people and the rest of the world to know the extent of the battle in South Vietnam. . . . How deeply are we involved . . . and what are the rights of the people to know . . .?

A. . . . We don't want to have information which is of assistance to the enemy—and it's a matter which I think will have to be worked out with the government of Vietnam. . . ."

—*Mr. Kennedy's Press Conference, Feb. 7.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Doctrine of "Incompatibility" Is Made to Order for Big Brother Nations

How Punta del Este Provided A New Cloak for Intervention

There is some disposition to regard the Punta del Este conference as a defeat for American policy, since we failed to obtain approval for economic and military sanctions against Cuba. But this is a short-sighted view, which assumes that the U.S. will be deterred by legalities in its determination to crush Castro. The key to the real meaning of the Punta del Este conference and the clue to coming events lies in the resolution, for which we obtained all but Cuba's approval, declaring any Communist regime "incompatible" with the Inter-American System. This seems on its face only a sort of declaration against sin. But it is well to remember that eight years ago, at the Caracas conference, John Foster Dulles (by a similar process of arm-twisting) won a similarly generalized statement against Communism in the Americas and used it three months later to cover the overthrow of the Arbenz government in Guatemala.

Like Stalin and Tito

The doctrine of "incompatibility" formulated at Punta del Este embodies in our hemispheric law the same principle Stalin applied to Tito, and Khrushchev applied first to Hungary and now to Albania. Regimes Big Brother does not like are declared "incompatible" with the area over which he rules. For the U.S., the doctrine of incompatibility offers a way around those basic provisions of the Organization of American States which forbid intervention "for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other States" (Art. 15) whether by military means or by "coercive measures of an economic or political character" (Art. 16).

With this doctrine of "incompatibility" we hope to erase these obligations of non-intervention by imposing a status of outlawry on Cuba. This doctrine of incompatibility is itself incompatible with the Charters of both the OAS and the United Nations. The former, adopted in 1948, has no provision for outlawry or exclusion and was framed as a regional pact subordinate to the United Nations. The latter calls for the peaceful coexistence of member States. Chapter 4 of the OAS Charter calls for submission of all inter-American disputes to negotiation or mediation "before being submitted to the Security Council of the United Nations." We have refused to negotiate our dispute with Cuba, rejected offers of mediation and certainly have no intention of submitting the dispute to the Security Council. This insistence on having our own way, irrespective of international obligation, again strikingly parallels Russia's refusal to countenance UN intervention in its overthrow of the Nagy government in Hungary. The UN is a pillar of U.S. policy when convenient for our purposes, as in the Congo, but its over-all authority is ignored where, as in Latin America, we propose to brook no outside interference.

Unfortunately it has been left to the Soviet States in a pot-and-kettle argument to raise this point in the current debate at the UN over the Cuban complaint against the U.S. The first week of the debate went slowly, since even countries like Yugoslavia and Poland were unwilling to risk aid from the United States by championing Cuba's cause while few countries seemed willing to take on the stultifying task of defending U.S. policy in the hemisphere. Our whole-hearted champion was Guatemala. It was Guatemala which threatened a walkout of Central American States at Punta del Este to stiffen U.S. resistance to compromise, and it is from Guatemala that we may expect new moves against Cuba. In Guatemala the United Fruit Company overthrew a revolutionary government and took back its lands. Guatemala is now its base for a similar offensive against Cuba where it also has lands to recover. Just as the U.S. has imposed new economic sanctions on Cuba even though economic sanctions were not authorized at Punta del Este, so we may expect to see military moves next, also without authorization but excused and covered by this new doctrine of "incompatibility."

The Resolution Before the UN

"The General Assembly, Deeply concerned over the tense situation in the Caribbean Sea area, the continuation of which is likely to increase the threat to universal peace and security, Recalling that it is a permanent aim of the United Nations to develop friendly relations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples and non-interference in the internal affairs of any State,

"1. Makes an urgent appeal to the Government of the United States of America to put an end to the interference in the internal affairs of the Republic of Cuba and to all the actions directed against the territorial integrity and political independence of Cuba;

"2. Calls upon the Governments of Cuba and the United States of America to settle their differences by peaceful means, through negotiations, without recourse to use of force."

—Draft resolution by Czechoslovakia and Romania.

Cuba Charges OAS Action Against Her Violates Charter of the UN

"We have been told that the social system adopted by our people is incompatible within the American system. We believe it is important to put this before the UN because it concerns the United Nations. . . . Article 1 of the Charter of the OAS reads as follows . . ., 'Within the UN, the OAS is a regional agency.'

"All members of the OAS were among the founding Members of the UN, together with other States having other social and political systems. The Charter of the UN, in its Preamble, sets out as one of the obligations of Member States 'to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors.' Article 1(2) of the Charter of the UN sets out as one of the purposes and principles of the UN 'to develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples. . . .'

"Can there be tolerance, can there be peaceful coexistence as good neighbors in international organisms when it does not exist in regional organisms? . . . Can it be considered consistent with the purposes and principles of the UN for a regional organization to discriminate against a member State because of its social system? What are these gentlemen of imperialism thinking of? What is their concept of international law?"

—Cuba's UN delegate, Mr. Garcia-Inchaustegui, opening debate on its complaint against the U.S. Feb. 5.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dantas Says Egypt and Iraq Would Now Be In Soviet Bloc If Treated Like Castro

Brazil's Argument at Punta del Este Against the Isolation of Cuba

By Foreign Minister Dantas of Brazil

"When the Western powers have had the foresight to leave a door open for maintenance of political, economic and cultural contact with the West, there has not been a single case [of Soviet penetration] which did not see the Western cause prevail, either in the form of the political institutions themselves or at least in the definition of the line of international conduct of the country in question. Very close to us is the example of Egypt. If, at the time of the Suez occupation, the U.S. had not had the foresight to leave the Egyptian government an alternative in the direction of the West, it is very probable that the U.A.R. would not have been able to escape the attraction of the Soviet bloc towards which isolation would have pushed it. In the same way, if, in the case of Iraq, England had not kept open a way for understanding with the West, that Arab country would not today be a Western bulwark in the Middle East. . . .

Protecting the Principle of Non-Intervention

"We wish to preserve and strengthen the unity of the Inter-American system and for this we think indispensable, not a unanimous and unworkable decision, but a constructive solution. We wish to defend the principles on which the regional system is based and, for the same reason, we do not wish to adopt dangerous solutions which make imprecise the limits of the principle of non-intervention. . . .

"The solutions presented here so far or announced by participating governments do not appear to correspond to the preoccupations of the Brazilian delegation. It is true that we saw with pleasure the gradual, and we hope unanimous, abandoning of the demand for military sanctions as an effective remedy for the case of Cuba. We would destroy the inter-American system the day that we would consider armed intervention as a means capable, not of repulsing an aggression which has materialized in particular acts, but of eliminating a political regime which is contrary to the democratic principles on which the Bogota charter is based. . . .

"We would not be living up to our responsibilities if . . . we tried to convert the regional organism into an instrument of investigation of the nature of regimes established from time to time in the American states and to give it the right to intervene to eradicate those that appear to have origins in the international communist movement.

"If we do not approve the application of military sanctions, in which happily we coincide with the general opinion, neither are we supporters of the imposition of economic and diplomatic sanctions. Both actions, in their character of multilateral measures comprised in Article 8 of the Rio Treaty, appear to lack solid juridical bases, as do the measures of military action. Analyzed in terms of their political effects, they appear to us, at best fruitless, and at worst, harmful, since economic sanctions would deprive Cuba of a business of diminutive proportions which contributes nothing to the maintenance of the Cuban economy, which is much more dependent on the markets of the NATO countries and, at present, of the countries which make up the Socialist bloc. As for the breaking of diplomatic relations, this would be a purely symbolic means of dealing with a problem for which we ought to find an effective solution within the framework of competition between East and West. If Cuba's relations with the Hemisphere countries are broken, the reasons that can bring her to total integration with the Soviet bloc will be accentuated, not lessened. . . .

"Above all we think imprudent the formula of informing Cuba that, in a specified time, she break the bonds that she maintains with the Sino-Soviet bloc, and placing her for that period under the supervision of a Committee which at the end of its work would report to an organ of the OAS. This formula of deferred sanctions has the grave political drawback of being a dangerous element of radicalization and excitation in the internal politics of various American states. We would thus provoke, as an unavoidable consequence, a battle in various states between forces desirous of influencing the second decision, which would give the Fidelista movement a continental resonance out of all proportion to its true significance at present."

Another Blacked Out Speech

Last week we reprinted portions of the speech made by President Dorticos at Punta del Este. This week we print on this page the heart of the plea made at that conference Jan. 24 by Brazil's Foreign Minister against Cuba's forcible isolation from the rest of the hemisphere. Neither speech was given adequate coverage in our press.

Brazilian Position on Cuba at the UN Misrepresented in New York Times

"Cuba Denounced by Brazil in UN" said the headline in the New York Times Feb. 9 over its account of the speech by the Brazilian delegate to the UN in the debate on the Soviet bloc resolution about Cuba. The account quoted an unnamed U.S. delegate as saying that the speech showed the only disagreement over Cuba "was over procedure."

The Brazilian did not denounce Cuba. He did say that by adopting Marxism-Leninism it had voluntarily cut itself off from the community of American states. But those parts of the speech not reported by the Times showed that Brazil's approach to the Cuban problem involved more than a difference of procedure with the U.S.

"In the opinion of the Brazilian delegation," Sr. de Melo Franco said, "the United Nations is now, as on other occasions, endeavoring to find a peaceful solution to a dispute which falls within the ambit of the so-called 'cold war', a solution imposed by the need for coexistence among Member States with diverse and at time conflicting political concepts and governmental practices. The UN was created partly to find peaceful solutions to differences; and, if this was its task at its inception, so much the greater is its responsibility in the field at present, when the nuclear era has made coexistence a compulsory solution, and we might add a solution leaving no alternative."

The Brazilian declared that in the United Nations "an American State may adopt the form of government it considers will best meet its internal needs, and any pressure exercised against such a State for this reason is a violation of the principle of non-intervention contained in Article 2 of the San Francisco Charter."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It's Not An Anti-Missile, It's Relaxation of Tension They Fear

(Continued from Page One)

which will come close enough to an ICBM to destroy it by means of an atomic explosion. There is also no problem about providing atomic warheads for anti-missiles. But the offense can send decoys along with their missiles which are almost impossible to distinguish from the missiles, and they can send many missiles simultaneously which saturate the radars of the defense. Thus I think the AICBM [anti intercontinental ballistic missile] virtually hopeless." It is for this heresy, which threatens the biggest military boondoggle ever dangled before the electronic industry, that Dr. Bethe is under attack. The development of the Nike-Zeus anti-missile system would provide from 15 to 20 billion dollars worth of business. Who cares that it might be rendered obsolete before its completion by the next development, a means to change the trajectory of the missile in mid-flight, which would frustrate all the intricate computing and targeting mechanisms of Nike-Zeus?

Too Many Excuses Worse Than None

It is in the perfection of these targeting and computing mechanisms, not in the warhead, that the secret of an anti-missile system lies. The warhead is essentially no different from the warhead of the missile. This is what makes doubly nonsensical the reports being leaked out of evidence that the Russians were testing an anti-missile. First, there is no way to determine from the debris or waves set off by a bomb whether it was being tested for missile or anti-missile purposes. Secondly, the testing of a warhead does not mean that either we or the Russians have solved the enormously intricate problem of targeting and computing for an anti-missile system. The explanations leaked out to the U.S. and British press are so varied as to create doubt. As in a criminal trial, too many alibis are worse than none. An accused who claims to have been (1) home in bed, (2) at a night club, and (3) only accidentally passing the scene of the crime when it happened is obviously a liar. One paper (the *London Sunday Times,* Feb. 11) says "suspicions [i.e. of an anti-missile] have increased since the discovery that two of the Russian tests on Novaya Zemlya appear to have involved relatively small nuclear weapons above the atmosphere" while another paper (the *London Sunday Observer,* Feb. 11) says the evidence of a Soviet anti-missile is "circumstantial". Since the U.S. last December successfully got a Nike-Zeus anti-missile to hit a Nike-Hercules missile "high above the White Sands proving ground in New Mexico" it is assumed (the *Observer* reports) that the Russians can do likewise!

A Publicity Gimmick

The truth is that this anti-missile excuse for resuming testing is, as one scientist phrased it privately to us, "a publicity gimmick." The real rationale for test resumption was expressed by Assistant Secretary of State Harlan Cleveland Feb. 10 at Rollins College, Florida. "Given the technology of nuclear weapons," Mr. Cleveland said, "the first requisite of orderly change is to prevent our Soviet rivals from getting ahead, or thinking they can get ahead, in the hidden and costly game of nuclear deterrence." The logic is the mutually disastrous logic of any arms race. If each side aims to show the other it can never get ahead, this must push both into ever bigger arms expenditure and further along the way to garrison states; Russia, back toward Stalinism; we toward a parallel revival of paranoid suspicion and repression. But this Administration, like the Democratic party as a whole, remains committed to the arms race as the line of least resistance, as a grandiose WPA for perpetual prosperity until the bombs go off. This is what lies behind the President's impossible new condition that we will enter no new moratorium without a means to detect Russian *preparations* for new tests. (Would we be prepared to open *our* laboratories for surveillance?) We fear any proposal which might interfere with another round of testing now that the Russians have had theirs. This has to stop somewhere but we don't really want the arms race to stop. This explains the press briefings immediately held here to make sure that the release of Powers was not interpreted as an improvement in Soviet relations, and the near panic visible in the wake of Khrushchev's suggestion that the top leaders meet on disarmament. All that talk about our waging a peace race is blarney, a gift with which Mr. Kennedy is richly endowed. It is not a Russian anti-missile that the dominant alliance of the military and arms industry fears. It is their old enemy, relaxation of tension.

Total Anti-Testing Letters to President: 2,413 (Feb. 14) But Please Keep Them Coming

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

2/19/62

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except the last Monday in August and the first in September and the last Monday in December and the first in January at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED